



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,098	07/03/2003	Richard Kai-Tuen Woo	60877-0039	7401
24341	7590	11/29/2006		EXAMINER
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP. 2 PALO ALTO SQUARE 3000 EL CAMINO REAL PALO ALTO, CA 94306			KIM, KEVIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2611	

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SK

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/614,098	WOO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kevin Y. Kim	2611	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 September 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 1-12 and 22-33 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 13,19-21,34,40 and 41 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 14-18 and 35-39 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on September 13, 2006 with respect to claims 13 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Applicant traverse the rejection of claims 13 and 34 by pointing out that McCrady, the prior art cited against the claims, does not teach clock synchronization because it teaches avoiding clock synchronization. Applicant thus concludes that the combination of the prior art references would not have been obvious. However, as applicant briefly mentions, the rejection of the claims was based on "the prior art known as the Peterson system" which requires a clock synchronization logic for adjusting the local clock synchronized with the local clock of the another device. Applicant has failed to establish the non-obviousness of the combination of "the Peterson system" and the Heath et al patent proposed in the previous Office action and repeated in this Office action.

The rejection of claims 1 and 22 is withdrawn as the arguments for the claims are persuasive.

3. Claims 13 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCrady et al (previously cited) in view of Heath et al (previously cited).
Claims 13 and 34.

McCrady et al describes a prior art positioning system and method, comprising;

a receiver for receiving a message from another device,
a local clock generator
receiver logic for determining a time of arrival of the message,
ranging logic for determining a respective range to the another device as a function of the determined time of arrival and
clock synchronization logic for adjusting the local clock synchronized with the local clock of the another device. See col. 2, line 34 ~ col.3, line 16.

Claimed invention is different from the prior art described by McCrady et al in that the messages are transmitted during assigned time slots whereas McCrady describes a CSMA-CA protocol for multiple access. However, TDMA that assigns time slots to respective communication devices are equally well known in the art as a multiple access protocol among others including CSMA-CA, as evidenced by Heath et al. See paragraph [0036]. Thus, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use TDMA as a multiple access protocol in the prior art described by McCrady et al, where messages from each communication devices are transmitted on assigned time slots.

4. Claims 19 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCrady et al in view of Heath et al, as applied to claims 13 and 34 above.

Claims 19 and 40.

These claims requires that the adjusting the local clock “with a precision better than on thousands of a clock cycle.” However, how precisely synchronize the clock signal is a obvious matter of design choice and thus the claimed precision would have been obvious to one skilled in

the art at the time the invention was made for the purpose of synchronizing the communication devices as much as possible. 0.

5. Claim 20, 21 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCrady et al in view of Heath et al, as applied to claim 19 above, further in view of Eidson (previously cited).

McCrady et al discloses all the subject matter claimed but is silent on the details of the local clock as opposed to the claimed invention which requires a counter updated at a rate controlled by a local oscillator. Eidson teaches implementing a local clock as a counter driven by an oscillator. See col. 3, lines 36-45.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 1-12 and 22-33 are allowed.

6. Claims 14-18, 35-39 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Y. Kim whose telephone number is 571-272-3039. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM --5PM M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jay Patel can be reached on 571-272-2988. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2611

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

November 27, 2006

AU 2611

**KEVIN KIM
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER**

